HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 3 Monday, January 20, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

BUDGET: *Where to cut* (page 1)

REUTHER: *Management fluffs a chance* (page 2)

ROCKEFELLER REPORT: *Who's behind it* (page 2)

RECIPROCAL TRADE: *Reluctant sponsor* (page 3)

EDUCATION: *Federal aid under fire* (page 3)

Hair-Curling Budget: A huge word-and-figure missile has described an arc from the White House to its target area — Capitol Hill — without (so far) an explosion. But the Budget is a delayed action entity and the town awaits the first sparks.

The time-bomb nature arises in large part from the huge bulk (four pounds) and complexity of the document. "It would take an Einstein in every committee staff to calculate the number of deeply imbedded 'free riders,'" was one crack from the cloakrooms. Last year Treasury Secretary George Humphrey served as a detonator with his truly prophetic phrase, "hair-curling." This year observers note the utterances of "Mr. Economizer," Senator Harry F. Byrd (D.-Va.), who labelled the new Budget "reckless" and "likely to lead to substantial deficit spending with all of its evil consequences."

Critical reactions on the Hill, where concededly there exist more politicians than economists, register even more sensitively than usual. One member from a rural district (and he echoes the sentiments of his grass-roots colleagues) roared, "I'm willing to take economy on agricultural items, but only on condition that there be sharp cuts in the appropriations designed to subsidize business and labor."

Obviously, there's more politics than classical economics in this volume which some in the Capital already term "a wonderland of Keynesian spending doctrine." Take the request in Big Spender Marion Folsom's budget for his Department of Health, Education and Welfare (which has no relation whatsoever to the defense budget): a paltry few millions are trimmed from the billions requested last year. Members indignantly say that the HEW budget should be cut at least a half-billion.

According to one story told in the cloakrooms, earnest Percival Brundage, the Director of the Budget, proposed to sink the knife deep in Folsom's fat piece of confectionery, but was called to the White House about the matter. Palace Guard boss Sherman Adams, who thinks only in terms of votes, vetoed Brundage's sharp reductions, and the latter retreated, an unhappy conservative. Rumors persist that Brundage may retire in the next few months.

And why — it is asked — should there be a $1 billion appropriation for the production of scientists and technologists, in order to speed up missile weapon output? This question testily comes from many congressional throats as the news goes round the Hill that a secret meeting of a score of industrial representatives six weeks ago reported its considered conclusions: *there does not exist any shortage of scientific manpower in the country; in fact, there is already a surplus.* What's the source for this news? Congressmen say: "Ask Westinghouse or General Electric." That being so: "Why this $1 billion touch to bolster Folsom's budget?"

● In calmer precincts than congressional offices, experts pore over the Big Book's pages and discover things like the following: David Shea Teeple, former official with the Atomic Energy Commission (see his piece "Nuclear Nonsense," in HUMAN EVENTS for February 11, 1956), declares that the proposed AEC budget, amounting to $2.28 billion, could be cut "at least" a half-billion dollars, by "elimination of nonessential programs, unconnected with the present defense effort." Others believe that such a cut could be a full billion, without hurting defense.

In short, those with sharp eyes are finding all sorts of items of "concealed waste," in areas which — as so-called defense appropriations — superficially look like they should be sacrosanct from the budget-cutting knife. One economy-minded Congressman was heard to remark: "How about the expense of keeping all those dependents of soldiers abroad — in Germany, Korea, *etc.?* We need those like a hoss needs caviar. I think that here's where we could cut out the activity, and save a billion dollars."

● Old-timers here remark that General Herbert Lord is not enshrined in history, but that he ought to be. Lord was Director of the Budget in the Twenties, when real Republican regimes ran the Government and cut the national debt from $24 billion to $16 billion. He had ways of doing many things, including preventing what is now called the Supplemental Appropriations Racket. Today, wily bureaucrats chortle privately when Congress cuts their requests for money. "We'll get all that back later with Supplemental Appropriations."

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they confidently say. (See Potomacus' "Confessions of a Bureaucrat," in Article Section of this issue.)

Under General Lord, however, each department had to set aside a percentage (for a long time ten per cent) of its budget after the latter was voted by Congress. Before any department head could dip into the reserve he would have to explain persuasively to Budget Director Lord the reasons for the encroachment. Lord's permission wasn't often granted. The Supplemental Appropriations Racket did not thrive in those days.

Indeed, the spirit of President Calvin Coolidge could well be revived today, say veterans with long memories. They recall the following incident:

Striped pants Protocol Officer Pierpont Moffett once went in to see Coolidge to get his approval for the seating order for the Dinner of State. Cal ran down the list and found Budget Director Lord ranked 23rd, way below the Cabinet. Cal exploded, in his New England way: "Why, that's the most important fellow I've got here — I want him put way up on this list." After some argument from Moffett, Cal settled for Lord being ranked eleventh, just below the Cabinet members and the Chief Justice, but above the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

Strategy on the Labor Front: "Showman" Walter Reuther has captured the headlines again by a maneuver designed to bolster his increasingly difficult position as a labor boss faced with a declining business situation. His demand that management give employees a share in the profits of industry was clearly made with no expectation that the heads of the auto companies would comply. As an astute public relations expert, Reuther realized that a renewal of his previous demand for a four-day week would not only meet with management's determined resistance but would also prove highly unpopular because of the defense crisis. To save our very national existence from Soviet missiles by cutting hours of work — that was scarcely a policy designed to win the general public approval.

Accordingly, the UAW boss had to throw out a dramatic proposal to cover his retreat on the four-day week. Other less imaginative bosses would have been content to let well enough alone and fight for maintaining present scales. But the man whom many of his enemies term the ablest politician in the country preferred to dash into another cockpit of controversy, theatrically raising a new and quite different issue — profit-sharing.

Disappointment marks the reaction of Capital observers to the auto companies' manner of handling this new Reutherian "line." The companies flatly rejected the union proposal as unworkable — which, of course, it is. But, in this sophisticated town, it is felt that the employers should have checkmated the Reuther demand by accepting profit-sharing "in principle," but adding a blunt demand that Reuther accept the obviously indispensable corollary to profit-sharing: acceptance by labor of "loss-sharing" (expressed in the form of wage reductions), when business is bad. Naturally, Reuther could never admit the principle of "loss-sharing" as a basis for negotiations. Another opportunity lost by the strategists of the employers — such is the conclusion in Washington.

"Liberals" and Foreign Policy: Further interesting facts are brought forward concerning Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, chief author of the controversial Rockefeller Report (see HUMAN EVENTS for January 13, 1958). A paper recently prepared by Major General Charles A. Willoughby — and inserted in the *Congressional Record* for January 9 — touches on Kissinger's background

Willoughby notes that Kissinger has been advertised as "a wartime intelligence specialist and policy consultant" to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. "In 1941," Willoughby says, "this chap was 18 years of age; in the Army in 1944, he was barely 21; if he was a policy consultant in the fifties he would have been around 27. It takes experience not normally accumulated at 21 to perform as an intelligence specialist; it takes even more experience to become a policy consultant to the JCS, the top echelon of the American command, the august makers of war and peace."

Moreover, Willoughby sarcastically concludes, Kissinger's celebrated "limited war" thesis is simply a repetition of that which produced "the horrible example of the Korean war, the nadir of American strategic planning contained in [General Omar] Bradley's definition of 'the wrong war, at the wrong time, in the wrong place.' To have this damaging conclusion accepted in print, in 1957, and declared a must for the top hierarchy in Washington, is one up for young Kissinger."

The question circulating in the Capital: how did "young Kissinger" become America's reigning expert on matters of military and foreign policy? Who pushed him up the ladder?

● Noted in this connection is the marked affinity Kissinger has demonstrated for the ideas of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Reviewing Acheson's recent book, *Power and Diplomacy* (Harvard University Press), in the *New York Herald Tribune*, Kissinger remarked on the "skill, balance and wisdom of [Acheson's] sweeping analysis," and endorsed Acheson's one-worldish proposal for a "workable and secure non-Communist world system." It is also observed that at a Book and Author Luncheon in New York last week, Acheson was unable to make his scheduled appearance to expound his views on world affairs. On hand as his replacement: Henry A. Kissinger.

● In dissecting what they believe are the mistaken ideas shared by Acheson and Kissinger, however, some analysts hasten to give "credit where credit is due" to both men in their current affray with former Ambassador to Moscow George F. Kennan. Kennan, in his role

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as "apostle of appeasement," has been advocating an ultra-soft approach in US relations with the Soviet Union (see HUMAN EVENTS for December 7, 1957). In a statement issued last week, Acheson explicitly dissociated the Democratic party from Kennan's remarks on "negotiation" and "neutralization."

"Mr. Kennan," said Acheson, "has never, in my judgment, grasped the realities of power relationships but takes a rather mystical attitude toward them. To Mr. Kennan there is no Soviet military threat in Europe." (In its issue of January 13, 1958, HUMAN EVENTS presaged the appearance of such relatively "tough" views on the part of the former Secretary.)

In commenting on Acheson's book, Kissinger levelled a similar blast at Kennan. Dismissing proposals for Summit conferences, "disengagement" and "neutrality" as "fatuous talk," Kissinger said that the "reasonable tone" of Kennan's London broadcasts "only obscures their explosive and potentially disastrous quality."

The real pitch on Acheson's apparent opposition to a Summit meeting with Khrushchev is this: it was prompted by practical political considerations. Acheson does not plump for a Summit conference now, although he may do so later, under other circumstances. For the idea of a Summit parley is strongly opposed by the American people — such is the message conveyed by returning members of Congress. And the Democratic high command — of which Acheson is an important figure — naturally does not want the Democratic party to espouse so unpopular a cause.

● Other "liberals" recently weighing in on America's foreign policy problems include Walter Lippmann, Paul Hoffman and Bertrand Russell, who propose "Three Roads to Peace" in the January 21, 1958, issue of *Look* magazine. Some Capital observers say the three-man symposium should have been retitled "The Long Crawl to Geneva," for it is the current "liberal" line on appeasement and the need for Summit conferences carried to its logical conclusion. Lippmann suggests that America must now recognize the claim of the Soviet Union to tyrannize over whomever it wishes, since it is now an "equal power." Hoffman advocates a vast spending program, along with such suggestions as giving the Russians equal time on the Voice of America. Russell pushes "coexistence" and Summit conferences.

Daily Worker columnist A. B. Magill praised *Look's* "three wise men," labelled their articles "three striking contributions to sanity," and lamented the fact that an article by Walter Reuther was not also included.

Magill summed up his praise of the "wise men": "They are in fact belatedly saying many things Communists said before them."

The Communist mouthpiece added that "the *Look* articles are products of the world-wide revulsion against the aggressive bullying foreign policy of the big business Eisenhower Administration and its chief architect, State Secretary John Foster Dulles."

Modern GOP: Symptomatic of the continued conflict between the Modern Republicans in the Executive branch and traditional GOP Members of Congress are the Administration's difficulties with its proposal for a five-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The Act gives the Administration authority to raise and lower America's tariff barriers, a power conservatives want in the hands of Congress.

For several frantic days last week the Administration could get no GOP member of the House Ways and Means Committee — which initiates all tax and tariff legislation — to sponsor its proposed extension. Of the eleven Republicans on the committee, only Representative Kean of New Jersey, a devout Modern Republican, was considered sympathetic to the bill.

Kean, however, hopes to run for the seat of retiring New Jersey Senator H. Alexander Smith, and preferred to steer clear of the extension (a previous version of which he had to introduce three years ago). White House pressure finally proved too much for Kean, and he at last caved in — an act which, it is believed, will handicap his race for Smith's seat.

Education Front: Resistance to the Administration's new education program begins to emanate from the grass roots. Taxpayer representatives in Wisconsin, as polled by the Public Expenditure Survey there, reflect these attitudes on the part of Dairy State citizens: (1) improving education is a matter of cleaning up the curriculum, rather than increasing expenditures; (2) education should remain a state and local responsibility; and (3) Federal aid necessarily means Federal control.

In Texas, two nominees for the top offices in the National Society of Professional Engineers had harsh comments for the Administration's plan to grant 10,000 annual science and engineering scholarships. Dr. Clark A. Dunn and Noah E. Hull, nominees for President and Vice President of the group, respectively, told the Houston Chronicle *that the scholarship plan was "wasteful" and that it "will complicate and aggravate an already serious [overcrowding] situation in the colleges."*

Foreign Aid Front: Representative Lawrence Smith (R.-Wis.) offers some revealing statistics on the foreign aid burden carried by the American people. The annual tax load for every man, woman and child in the US, Smith discloses, is $418. The average for Europe, however, is only $11 a year. Thus Americans must shoulder 38 times as much in taxes as do Europeans. In 1956, says the Wisconsin Congressman, Americans spent $1976 per family for government, and only $1352

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per family for food. The reason for this is that "American foreign aid has been used to balance European budgets, to reduce European taxes and to reduce European national debts."

● Still other questionable uses of American foreign aid dollars are cited by William L. McGrath, President of the Williamson Company of Cincinnati and former employer delegate to the International Labor Organization. In a speech before the Annual Meeting of The Cincinnati Club, McGrath cited the futile expenditure of American dollars on dams, roads, items of apparel and countless projects which the recipients neither need nor want. Moreover, he continued, in such countries as Italy, Yugoslavia, Norway, Poland and India, our foreign aid funds have gone to support socialism and outright communism — all in the name of free enterprise.

Radio Free Europe: Followed with heightening interest is the series of columns and radio broadcasts turned out by Fulton Lewis, Jr. on the subject of Radio Free Europe. Beginning with a broadcast early last October, Lewis has delved far into the unusual workings of this organization, focussing on such matters as its means of financial support (consisting, in part, of contributions from thousands of private American citizens), the use to which its funds are put, and the ideological convictions of its staff members.

Brought out in the Lewis analysis have been such items as an RFE directive telling its operatives that "it is necessary to glorify the figure of Marshal Tito in the eyes of Yugoslavia and the Western world. Tito is a hero who has saved the nation from exploitation by foreign barbarians and led them from their own possible downfall to a happy future." Such information has come as news indeed to many of RFE's innocent American contributors.

Similarly, Lewis quotes an RFE comment on five Rumanian anti-Communists who in 1955 captured the Red Rumanian Embassy in Berne, Switzerland, exposing it as a center of Communist espionage. RFE commentator Noel Bernard characterized the action as one of "complete lawlessness," stating that "all the civilized world condemns the act executed by this group of Rumanians." Bernard added his "hope that the young anti-Communist Rumanians will receive their deserved punishment for their actions, for which they are totally guilty."

More Lewis broadcasts on this subject will be forthcoming. The commentator's office informs HUMAN EVENTS that when the series is completed, it may be made available in printed form, if public request justifies the expense.

More On Dahlberg: Conservatives continue to wax angry over the appointment of Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg as President of the National Council of Churches. In its issue for December 14, 1957, HUMAN EVENTS called attention to Dahlberg's background of affiliation with subversive groups, and gave the listings for him that appear in the files of *National Republic*, respected Washington research organization.

Since publication of that item, other researchers have come forward with additional information on Dahlberg. Fulton Lewis, Jr. devoted his syndicated column for December 19, 1957, to Dahlberg, citing three undertakings which were not included in the HUMAN EVENTS story. Similarly, a West Coast researcher on communism offers four additional listings for the new NCC President. (*National Republic* advises HUMAN EVENTS that the second listing contained in the December 14 item — "sponsor, Political Prisoners' Bail Fund Committee" — is a listing for "Edward Dahlberg," not Edwin.)

Among those attacking the appointment of Dahlberg has been the *Christian Beacon*, a Protestant journal. Denouncing Dahlberg's plea for "massive reconciliation" with the Soviet Union, the *Beacon* stated: "There can be no reconciliation between God and the Devil . . . Peaceful coexistence is another term for peaceful surrender."

John T. Flynn, news analyst for the Mutual Broadcasting System, capped the comment with this wry question: "Was there no one else to fill this important post?"

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Member of Congress, 15th District of Pennsylvania: "I look forward each week to HUMAN EVENTS' timely and incisive presentation of the news. In my capacity as Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I particularly appreciate your courageous opposition to the threat presented by the Communists and their allies."

MRS. JOHN PHILIP SOUSA, JR.: "HUMAN EVENTS keeps its readers up to date on the important happenings about them, and evaluates them with thought and intelligence. I wholeheartedly recommend it."

ELMER T. PETERSON, Editorial Writer, Daily Oklahoman-Oklahoma City Times: "There is crying need for a fearless publication like yours, and, as one citizen, I appreciate the job you are doing. I am greatly concerned over some of the trends in Washington and your vigilance is a wholesome influence."

Additional copies of this 4-page News Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, no stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In 5000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Bound Annual Volume for 1957, with complete index, $15. 1955 and 1956 volumes available at same price. None available for previous years.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 3 HUMAN EVENTS January 20, 1958

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

CONFESSIONS OF A BUREAUCRAT

Or: How the Federal Budget Got That Way

By POTOMACUS

I WAS a bureaucrat. What's more, I liked it. Even now, I feel a bit defiant and somewhat furtively proud. But I'm prouder still that I quit, and I wouldn't want my son or brother to go through the same thing.

For six mad years I kept it up, accumulating leave and retirement insatiably. Then I made up my mind and broke off — suddenly. I never could have done that without the loyal support of friends and family — especially my wife, who was pretty wonderful throughout. Today I can look back at the whole affair calmly, though I confess to twinges of nostalgia when I see a Standard Form 57 (fortunately, this does not happen very often), and each year a flood of memories sweeps over me when the President's Budget is presented to Congress. Old bureaucrats are never wholly cured. Individual cases, however, can be, and more of them should be, arrested.

You don't get into a thing like that all at once. With me, as with so many, you could trace it to the War. Even then, it didn't happen overnight. First I went to work for a company that had a Government contract. I was told — and believed — that this was private enterprise. But it was "cost-plus," and, believe me, the step from that to the direct Federal payroll is tragically easy.

Still, there is a difference. I felt it the first time I was asked to *approve* a form instead of having to make one out. Naturally, the first form sent to me for action was not very important, but as I routed it through the interoffice mail to another division, a subtle intoxication began to spread through my veins. No more fretting over Governmental inaction or caprice. I realized that now I *was* the Government.

There is much for the neophyte to learn. A man from the Budget Bureau told me: Never respond to a communication except in the same form it comes to you. A phone call for a phone call, a memo for a memo, a letter for a letter. To answer a memo with a phone call would be abrupt, a memo in reply to a phone call might look servile — might *overcommit* you. Best *maintain* (this was not the Budget Bureau man's phrasing) a kind of Newtonian principle — for every action an equal, and opposite, reaction. Obvious exception: if in your absence someone calls in person at your office, ignore it. Either he is a pest or else you've got him over a barrel.

One of the simplest yet most effective expedients, I learned, is to acquire duties at two or more different locations. A desk in the vicinity of the Ellipse, plus responsibilities on or near Capitol Hill, yields considerable freedom for maneuver. To an observer in either place you might well be at the other, or in instances of communication between the two regarding your whereabouts you could well be tied up in traffic. Anyone who sees you coming out of a hotel in midafternoon will understand that all Washington hotels are infested with lobbyists whose special pleadings must be rejected, but who certainly, as taxpayers, have a right to a hearing.

If it be objected that multiple duty-stations involve multiple duties, the answer is that it is good to be loaded with more duties than anyone could possibly perform, for then you are never at a loss to explain failure to perform any of them.

The dispersed-duties arrangement, though neglected by the majority, is singularly democratic in its potential availability to all grades of civil servants, from messengers, through auditors, to agency heads. My own job was absolutely ideal in this regard. (Indeed, it was a bureaucrat's dream in many respects.) I was an "Organization and Methods Examiner." We could go anywhere in our own agency and had reason to check with many other agencies. We could ask anyone why he was doing whatever he was doing, with the implication not that we were ignorant, but that he must justify his position. Consequently, while we would be received with courtesy, our failure to show up anywhere was an occasion for relief rather than disappointment or complaint.

ONCE, on a special mission, I achieved the ultimate in this kind of freedom. I had a blanket travel order, a book of travel requests, and an assignment to "make a study" of a nation-wide problem which topside really wanted swept under the rug. By simply signing a "TR" (request for transportation) I could go by rail or air to any point in the continental US. Since I was authorized to go everywhere, no one expected me to be particularly anywhere. Since I was authorized to ask questions, all our field offices were prepared to greet me with solicitude, make my stay as untroubled as possible, and expedite my departure

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with genuine efficiency. Since the study for which I was responsible admitted of no answer that anyone wanted to hear, Washington was not on my neck for anything. To be sure, the per diem expense allowance was inadequate, but if you can be comfortable on a Pullman, the TR's (which don't come out of the per diem) take care of a place to sleep, and you can eat on nine dollars a day if you aren't finicky and don't make a hog of yourself.

I have other achievements to my credit as well. In what I believed was an entirely original departure, I discovered that subordinates are a nuisance — and not, as so many bureaucrats suppose, actually necessary to empire-building at all. Indeed, by pointedly *not* demanding assistants or a clerical force of your own, you may so baffle the personnel officer that he will sign your own promotion with only a dazed awareness of what you have actually written into your own job description. You become an apostle of economy in Government, and everyone else is so embarrassed by what he is doing that no one thinks to inquire what you are doing.

My philosophy came to be: Underlings tie you down as much as overlings. Get someone else's secretary to do your typing, put on your own boss's desk an *interim* report which confronts him with a dilemma, and you're off to the races — at Laurel, perhaps.

THE FUNDAMENTAL rule of bureaucratic life is this: *find out what the decisions are going to be, and give it as your opinion that that is what they ought to be.* I know that this is easier said than done, but most people don't even try. There are clues. Don't neglect them. I had a friend who was quite successful, who made a habit of putting something into the record on every possible side of any pending decision. Thus, in the outcome, he was able to produce evidence that he had been for it, no matter what it was, and few of his rivals were sufficiently energetic to show that he had also been against it.

The best is when you have a pipeline to higher authority. I recall — rather early in my experience — a conference with representatives of two other divisions who at the time both outranked me by a grade or so, and who on the matter at issue had much more logical arguments than I had. Indeed, I knew scarcely anything about the subject — except one thing: I knew what the Executive Director of the agency was going to do (which in this case, as in so many, was nothing at all). To all the reasoning, pleading, threatening, cajoling, and rational expostulation of my colleagues on the *ad hoc* committee I merely said, No. I just sat there and said, No, regardless of what they said. They outargued and outvoted me and we went to the Director's office and they made their proposal — with reasons, and I said I was against it, without bothering with reasons, and the Director said that on mature deliberation he was compelled to agree with me (actually, you see, because I had taken the preliminary precaution of agreeing with him), and it was not long before I was promoted and one of those guys left the agency, and the other stuck in grade as long as I can remember.

But of course you don't want to be a door mat for higher authority. It is small advantage to receive tips and favors if in return you have to work yourself to death and also wonder how long the sunshine is going to last. So you have to get something on them. We used to say of an adept in this art: he knows where the bodies are buried. If you do know, well and good. But you can't always find out, and your own boss may have done absolutely nothing, in which case he is not vulnerable. The problem is how to overtake him without really doing anything yourself.

You may decide to *take a stand.* This can sometimes demoralize — to your advantage — a whole division. Back in 1948 I hit upon the simple device of coming into the office carrying somewhat ostentatiously but carelessly a copy of the Washington *Times Herald* — published in those days by the late great Cissy Patterson, cousin of the late Colonel Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago *Tribune.*

The effect was to scatter before me like chaff my rivals and *their* camp-followers — all terrified at the thought of being seen near a *Times Herald* reader in an agency which almost depended for its existence on the rival, ultra-"liberal" Washington *Post.* Yet the tactic was nearly foolproof. Most of my superiors would never know what newspaper I read; those who did not only could not say anything to me about it, but would be forced to defend me to any of the cruder sycophants who might mention it to them; and I began to receive from my office mates a bit of the respect due him who lives dangerously.

Paradoxically, some of the shrewder observers concluded that I was probably — because I *openly* read a reactionary newspaper — in some kind of inner clique of progressives. Reasoning: No one would read the *Times Herald* unless he had assurance that it was all right to do so. No such assurance was in my case visible. Thus I must have some hidden assurance. Analogy: if you see a poker-faced guy wearing a hat coming out of the Justice Department building with a copy of the *Daily Worker* under his arm, he is probably an FBI.

I could go on reminiscing and amoralizing indefinitely about such matters as:

- The importance of cultivating secretaries, chauffeurs, and others of the indispensables who really control so much.
- Avoiding, if possible, decisions which others will review (unless, as noted above, you have advance information on what the reviewing officer's own decision will be), but making prompt decisions if yours will probably be the last word.*

* Examples: it is dangerous to recommend purchases or promotions which someone else has to approve prior to their becoming effective, but it is usually OK to present as *faits accomplis* transfers or promotions that somebody wants and you have approved, since nobody will ordinarily be willing to take the responsibility of reversing you; and it is usually OK to give job applicants and salesmen from outside the brush-off, since they seldom know where to go to appeal your decision.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● Having *a reason* for what you do, or omit doing, no matter whether it is a good reason or not (come into court with a plea: maybe your action was mistaken — everybody makes mistakes — it was not fraudulent — they can't put you in jail for it — if they can't put you in jail they can't fire you — if they can't fire you they will sooner or later have to promote you — but don't just stand there and say nothing).

● Playing your own game, not the other fellow's, in all possible situations (examples: talk to accountants about getting the Big Job done — it makes them feel like old maids; talk to construction men about costs and records — it makes them feel guilty; with lawyers you'll have trouble, but you may be able to catch one of them in a literary or minor grammatical lapse, and that will bother him, though almost anything else he will brazen out).

● The importance of getting the jump; it is vital when you have made a mistake yourself to find quickly a mistake of someone else's and create a scene over it (in the end you may magnanimously offer to forget the whole business).

OF COURSE most of these things, and many others besides, are known to organization men — in or out of Government. What is unique with the bureaucracy is the Budget. Indeed, the Federal Government can hardly be said to have existed (in other than a legitimate sense) before the passage of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. It was this formal provision for analysing in advance the possibilities of waste and confusion that gave rise to the planned extravagance with which we are now familiar.

In all the years preceding our entry into World War I the United States Government never spent so much as $1 billion in any one year. In the years following World War I, and following the establishment of the Budget, expenditures averaged $3 billion a year for the Coolidge and Hoover administrations, $7 billion for the first two Roosevelt administrations, and (skipping World War II) $58 billion in the last Truman and first Eisenhower administrations. Now up for bewildered consideration is a $74 billion Budget. Nobody knows where we go from here, and nobody knows how much the Budget itself contributes to the increases.

It is sometimes thought (by those who have not investigated the matter very closely) that the Budget puts Government on a businesslike basis, but of course there is not — and cannot be — anything in business like the Federal Budget. The difference is this: *In business a budget is a means of controlling the expenditure of funds that come from sales or loans; in Government the Budget is itself the means of providing funds. In business the less you spend the more you have — other things being equal. In Government the other things cannot be equal — and the less you spend the less you get.*

We are accustomed in business to the fact that a Controller on the one hand and a Vice President in charge of Sales on the other will as a rule have different temperaments, different attitudes, and that the professional caution of the former is a useful brake on the imaginative dynamism of the latter. But in a Government agency the Controller (Budget Officer) *is* the Vice President in charge of Sales. It is he who must sell the needs of the agency to the Congress. To get an appropriation he must show that the agency needs it.

Assume that he is entirely honest. It is true that if he needs $1 million and gets it he is just as well off as if he needs $2 million and gets that. Nevertheless, the future is obscure; it is better to ask for $2 million and find you need only $1 million than to ask for one and find that you need two.*

But though the future is obscure, the immediate past is not. And while it is embarrassing to have asked for less than you need, it is only somewhat less embarrassing to have asked for more than you need.

To avoid the second embarrassment is, however, comparatively easy. You simply spend what you get. It you don't spend it, you obviously did not need it, and were extravagant to ask for it. If you do spend it, who can say that you did not need to do so? Thus your reputation for economy will be better if you spend more (at least to the hilt) rather than less, and with this reputation you will be able to ask for still more next year.

TO ILLUSTRATE: suppose that you are a Federal agent in a Midwestern city, and that you believe that your office will need a new sedan by, say, January, 1960. Obviously, you cannot be sure what your needs will be by then, but your inspections (or whatever you do) will probably go on increasing, and you have little difficulty in convincing yourself that it is better to be safe than sorry. And because the Budget-making process is long and involved, you had better be thinking about it right now.

You go to your field-office chief. He asks you, as if he were going to refuse the request, why you need a new car, but you know more about the actual work than he does, and so he can't press you too hard or that fact will show up, and so he says OK, we'll put it into the estimates and see what Washington says.

By "Washington" he means your agency headquarters there. When they ask him to justify the sedan, he gives them the arguments you have given him, but with more enthusiasm, because he does not know — as you do — the arguments *against* the proposed purchase which you disposed of in your own mind before you ever went to him. Besides, he carries more weight with Washington than you do

* You understand that the use of these terms is not intended to imply that there is anything in the Federal Budget considered worth debating that costs so little as a million dollars. A million is simply the smallest unit regularly employed in the tables accompanying the President's Budget Message to Congress, and other budgetary documents of general interest.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with him, because Washington is even more ignorant of his problems than he is of yours. This gives him added confidence, and the sedan is included in the estimates submitted by the agency to the Bureau of the Budget.

Now the Budget Bureau will work the thing over. Somebody there will be an "expert" on your agency, he may even come to your office to ask you what you are really doing. This trip will cost money, too, and he will probably return to Washington convinced that he is the only disinterested person in the Nation's Capital who understands why you need that sedan.

The most formidable hurdle is now looming up. The House Appropriations Committee will put your Washington bosses through their paces, and the ranking Member of the opposition party will probably make some scathing remarks. But by now the momentum of your request is terrific. Your field chief, your agency head, the Bureau of the Budget, and the White House are by this time dedicated to the proposition that if because of Congress you don't get that sedan, the Executive Branch will not care to be responsible for the subsequent fate of national policy. Herblock may draw a cartoon of you riding a mule across the desert to a satellite-launching platform, while a round-faced Congressman lolls down Constitution Avenue in a chauffer-driven Imperial, wreathed in cigar smoke and saying something stupid about economy.

The sedan will be in the Budget approved by Congress. The process will have been completed by the end of June, 1959.

Now ask yourself: after all this, when January, 1960 rolls around, do you think there is a chance that you will decide *not* to go ahead and buy that sedan, whether by then you actually need it or not?

THE ONLY WAY I know of in which the preceding illustration is not typical of the Budget process is that the purchase of motor vehicles is more strictly controlled than almost any other item of Federal expense.

> There is no telling how much money is spent overall just because it has been appropriated, no telling how much has been appropriated just because it has been requested, and no telling how much has been requested just because the Budget estimates are due, and you've got to get something in the estimates or go out of the bureaucrat business.

There is also no telling how much is spent on the preparation of the Budget. You take a copy of the President's Budget and it is as big as an unabridged dictionary. But that is a small part of the story. Every agency has submitted to the Budget Bureau a vast quantity of material, of which only a small fraction has been used in the President's Budget. I recall the shock I had the first time I saw the final result of the labors in our agency. We had knocked ourselves out — overtime for the clericals, late hours for the chiefs — and we had dozens of volumes of mimeographed stuff, estimates and "back-up material," and what we had was a condensation of stuff worked up in the field offices, each of which had more "back-up material" they had not even sent us. All this — thousands of pages and hundreds of tables — was represented by just a few paragraphs in the President's Budget. I will say this: we goofed off on a lot of things, but we *worked* on preparing the Budget. *That* is a bureaucrat's lifeline, and he will fight to the death for it.*

Some of you will recall a novel entitled *Brewster's Millions*. Brewster, having inherited from a wealthy relative a million dollars (tax-free in those days), was bequeathed several millions by another rich uncle, or somebody — on condition that within a year he spend every last cent of the first legacy, such was the rancor between the two deceased kinsmen. There were conditions prohibiting absolute destruction of cash or goods, and limiting charities. The suspense of the novel lay in the question: can this guy — on an average and within the rather tolerant rules — spend $2,740 dollars a day, Sundays included, for one whole year?

Brewster's Millions was written before the days of the Federal Budget. A modern bureaucrat would simply be bored by Brewster's problem. He could do that on his coffee break. Yet his sophistication should not blind him to the fact that someone before his time discovered the key principle of the budgeted bureaucracy in an age of global peril: *Security by achievement, and achievement by expenditure.*

* Once I saw a really beautiful brochure that had charts with transparent plastic overlays, in color, prepared by one of our "cost-plus" contractors to show how economical he was.

"Potomacus" is the pseudonym of a former employee of a large Government agency. After six years on the Federal payroll, he "kicked the habit" and returned to private business.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "CONFESSIONS OF A BUREAUCRAT"

at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED